

months to properly build up such an invasion and force? How much more misery and devastation will have occurred by then, and does that serve the interests of refugees and innocent civilians?

I am not impressed by foreign leaders who take it upon themselves to lecture the American people about where our duty lies or how we must not be so misguided as to slip into isolationism. This argument is simply not warranted in light of the history of the last 50 years or in reference to the present situation. Responsible internationalism does not mean we must be stampeded into using force when our national interest is not well defined and other means short of force have not been exhausted.

I plan to offer a resolution with my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), a resolution that would neither mandate withdrawal on the one hand nor escalate the war and do a ground invasion on the other. This resolution would bar the introduction of ground forces from Kosovo and the rest of Yugoslavia. Why is such a course preferable? Because once having initiated hostilities, even if it was a policy based on flawed premises, we cannot simply walk away and wash our hands of the problem. The bombing has created certain facts: for our own policy, the perception of Yugoslavian government, and not least for the refugees. At the same time, however, we should avoid military escalation in a region where the only rational and durable solutions are political in nature.

I use the term "escalation" with good reason, because the parallels with Vietnam are striking. For that very reason this resolution would prohibit ground combat operations in Yugoslavia without specific authorization in law because the mission creep in Kosovo is similar to U.S. force deployments in the early stages of Vietnam. Viewed through the lens of history, our force buildup in the region and our edging towards ground combat operations could be the prelude to another Gulf of Tonkin incident. Members also should be aware that this resolution specifically exempts search-and-rescue missions.

But drawing a legislative bright line between bombing and boots on the ground is only one element of the solution. The problem is now bigger than Kosovo, and I believe America should actively encourage the mediation of a settlement before this crisis becomes a wider conflict. To the objection that mediation will not work, I say we will never know unless we, the United States, throw greater weight behind such efforts.

I do not underestimate the difficulties that are involved, but should Milosevic balk, we will retain the ability to apply military pressure from the

air. Once a settlement is reached, an international force may be necessary to assist the refugee return and oversee reconstruction. We should be more flexible about the makeup of this force than we have been in the past. Rather than making its composition a non-negotiable end in itself, we should bear in mind that the international force is the means to an end; that means to an end, peace and stability in Kosovo where ethnic Albanians can live in safety and with autonomy.

Last week I urged the President to call for a special meeting of the G-8 countries to begin a formal effort to achieve a peaceful settlement. This G-8 meeting could help initiate a framework for a diplomatic solution of the crisis and begin to put in place the foundation for economic assistance to the region. Delegations from the Ukraine and other affected regional countries could also be invited. Such a meeting is only the beginning of a long and difficult process, but it is a step our country should not be afraid to take.

I am pleased that the President appears to be responding positively. This week Strobe Talbott, the Deputy Secretary of State, was dispatched to Moscow for discussions on Kosovo, and I hope that these talks are a prelude to the heads of governments of the affected countries making a concerted effort at a political settlement.

The United States can and should remain strongly engaged internationally because regional instability will not solve itself. But we must choose our tools very carefully, for the stakes do not allow for failure. I believe America needs to draw a careful balance between our military and diplomatic efforts. Right now there is an imbalance in favor of military means. While maintaining the option of military pressure from the air, we should avoid boots on the ground or rather boots in a Balkan quagmire. That is why the Fowler-Kasich-Goodling resolution is the right approach and deserves the support of this House. In the longer term, however, we should seek opportunities for a lasting and enforceable political settlement.

#### WISHING DR. DAVID STRAND OF ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY A HAPPY RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a very good friend of mine, Dr. David Strand, to recognize his pending retirement as president of Illinois State University in Bloomington, Illinois. I would be remiss not to come here today to honor Dr. Strand, for throughout his long and distinguished tenure, spanning from 1978 until 1999 at

the university at Normal, Illinois, Illinois State University, Dr. Strand has helped shape the lives of thousands of young men and women. Over the years graduates of Illinois State University have traveled far beyond the borders of Illinois and have spread out around the country to become some of the best and the brightest in their respective fields.

As doctors, lawyers, educators, business professionals and civic leaders, these men and women have gone on to help shape the United States into the prosperous, peaceful and strong Nation we are today. Dr. David Strand through his years of service helped make this happen, and for this we, as a Nation, owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, too often we fail to realize the importance of talented educators like Dr. Strand. Not only has Dr. Strand maintained the integrity and high academic standards for the university, but as a classroom professor, a professor of education, David has mentored countless young teachers, those men and women who will in kind touch thousands of other young lives. Those teachers and their students will secure the future of our Nation far into the next century, this in part due to the efforts of Dr. Strand.

As a community leader, David has made a permanent mark on his community and our State. He has worked with the public libraries, the community concert association and the Boy Scouts, just to name a few. He has been honored on many occasions by numerous organizations for his many community and professional accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and recognize David Strand for the contributions he has made to Illinois State University and the Bloomington/Normal community. David Strand is indeed an administrator, an educator and citizen that we, as a Nation, can and should with one voice say "Thank you."

Mr. Speaker, I enter this statement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so this and future generations of Americans can be aware of the numerous contributions of a man I am honored to call a friend, Dr. David Strand of Bloomington, Illinois, and I wish Dr. Strand a happy, healthy and enjoyable retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my good friend, Dr. David Strand, to recognize his pending retirement as President of Illinois State University in Bloomington, Illinois.

I would be remiss not to stand here today honoring Dr. Strand, for throughout his long and distinguished tenure spanning from 1978 until 1999 with Illinois State University, Dr. Strand has helped shape the lives of thousands of young men and women.

Over the years, graduates of Illinois State University, have traveled far beyond the borders of Illinois, and have spread out around the country to become some of the best and brightest in their respective fields.

As doctors, lawyers, educators, business professionals and civic leaders, these men and women have gone on to help shape the United States into the prosperous, peaceful and strong nation we are today. Dr. David Strand, through his years of service, helped make this happen, and for this, we, as a nation, owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, too often, we fail to realize the importance of talented educators like David Strand. Not only has Dr. Strand maintained the integrity and high academic standards for the University, but in the classroom, as a Professor of Education, David has mentored countless young teachers—those men and women who will, in kind, touch thousands more young lives. Those teachers, and their students, will secure the future of our nation far into the next century. This is, in part, due to the efforts of Dr. Strand.

As a community leader, David has made a permanent mark on his community and our state. He has worked with the public libraries, the community concert association and the Boy Scouts just to name a few. He has been honored on many occasions by numerous organizations for his many community and professional accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and recognize David Strand for the contributions he has made to Illinois State University and the Bloomington/Normal community. David Strand, is indeed, an administrator, educator, and citizen that we as a nation, can, and should, with one voice, say "thank you."

Mr. Speaker, I requested that this statement be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that this, and future generations Americans can be aware of the numerous contributions of a man I am honored to call "friend"—Dr. David Strand of Bloomington, Illinois.

I wish Dr. Strand a happy, healthy and enjoyable retirement.

#### MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to talk today about Medicare.

This is a program that we hear lots about in the news and in political campaigns, and people talk about it as though they all understood what they were talking about. I would like to talk a little bit about the program today and then talk about what all the excitement is about, what people are talking about, why they are talking.

The first thing that needs to be said about Medicare is that it is a success. People will talk about it: It is about to fail, it is going to collapse, it is the end of the world. But if you were active politically before 1965, the situation was very much different for senior citizens in this country.

I put this graph up because I think it is important to remember what it was like before Medicare. In 1965, 54 percent

of senior citizens did not have health insurance. Less than half the people in this country had health insurance when they got to be 65. Today, in 1999, 99 percent of senior citizens are covered.

Now what that has done for not only the senior citizens, but their children and their grandchildren, has been enormous because it has had an impact on them both from a financial standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the security of knowing that, as a senior citizen, you have health care benefits, and you do not have to go to your kids and have your kids take care of you, and for that reason it has been an enormous success.

There are 39 million elderly and disabled people in this country who are on the Medicare program. We spent about \$207 billion in 1997, and that is the last year we have good solid figures for; that is about 11 cents out of every Federal dollar goes for taking care of senior citizens in this country, and it amounts to about \$1 and 5 of every dollar spent on health care in this whole country.

Now let me put up the second one here. Part of the reason why we have so much discussion about Medicare is it is such a big program. If we look at the Federal budget, and we can do a short budget course here, the biggest element of our budget is Social Security which takes 22 cents out of every dollar. Defense takes 15 cents out of every dollar, and then we come to the interest on the debt which is 11 cents on every dollar, and Medicare, 11 cents out of every dollar. So, Mr. Speaker, it is the third largest or fourth largest expenditure in the Federal budget. We spend 6 percent on a program called Medicaid, which is a State program for poor people's health, and all the rest of government is 35 percent.

So Medicare is an enormous program that is used by, as I say, 39 million people, both the elderly and the disabled.

□ 1715

You hear or read in the newspaper that Medicare is going to go broke, and you say to yourself, well, how could a program that is that valuable to so many people, spends that amount of money, how could it possibly go broke? What is it about this program?

I want to explain it, because it is easy when you are watching television and listening to people or reading the newspaper to not really understand what Medicare is. Medicare is actually two programs. The first program is Part A.

Now, in 1965, the problem was that they looked out and they said, "Senior citizens don't have any hospitalization, so we ought to put together a program for hospitalization for seniors." So Part A covers inpatient hospitalization, it covers skilled nursing facilities and it covers hospice care; and bene-

ficiaries, senior citizens, pay a deductible and then they pay a certain amount of cost-sharing. They pay 20 percent of the bill when it comes, when they are in the hospital.

Now, when they were passing this bill through the House, it started out just as Part A. As it went along, Members of the House said, "This is dumb. Why are we passing a bill that will pay for senior citizens to go into the hospital, but do absolutely nothing for their doctor bills?"

So somebody said, well, "Let's add Part B." Part B includes the physician's cost, that is the doctor's payment, the laboratory costs, x-rays, outpatient services, mental health services, and Part B is paid for from the beneficiaries. Senior citizens pay a premium. Every senior pays \$45.50 a month as part of their cost, and then they also pay the cost-sharing of various parts, 20 percent or whatever.

Now, here comes what the real problem is: How do we pay for that? Well, of course, the beneficiaries are paying something, but most of what is paid in by people, in Part A, 89 percent of the money comes from payroll taxes. That means everybody who is working is putting money into Part A. It is called a trust fund.

Over the years with that trust fund, we increased the amount. Everybody who is working pays 1.45 percent of your earnings into the trust fund, and the employer pays 1.45 percent of your salary into the trust fund. Those are the payroll taxes that are on your stub. So senior citizens' health care is being paid for by the workers today.

It used to be there were four or five workers for every senior citizen. In the future it is going to get down to the point where there are about two people working for every senior citizen drawing benefits out of this program. So when people say that the Medicare is going broke, they are saying that there are not going to be enough workers paying payroll taxes to pay for the benefits for hospitalization. It is only that part, Part A of Medicare, that is going broke or is not going to have enough money.

Now, on the other side, on Part B, on this side you remember I said everybody pays a \$45.50 premium, so about 22 percent of Part B is paid by the premiums, by senior citizens themselves. They pay for it. Then 76 percent of it comes out of the Treasury of the United States.

Now, nobody can tell me that the Treasury of the United States, the richest country on the face of the Earth, is going to go broke. So when people talk about Medicare going broke, they are talking only about this part and not about Part B, because this part is not. There is no way we are not going to pay for the health care of our seniors in this country.

Looking at the last slide again, one of the ways in which we have dealt